

# Christianity and

PUBLIC LIBRARY

OCT 18 1952

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion **DETROIT**

VOL. XII, No. 17

OCTOBER 13, 1952

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

## The Impatience of Man

*The Lord is King, be the people never so impatient.*

THOSE are the opening words of the 99th Psalm in the old Coverdale version still in use in the Book of Common Prayer. The translation is incorrect but the contrast which the words point holds good. God is King. Human destinies are in his hands. Above the schemes and plans of the impatient, restless, unquiet children of men hurrying to build their social orders, to find some blue print for the satisfactory completion of their community life, rules the patient and unhurried God. Those are no short cuts to the building of the "beloved community." Prefabricated houses may be put up in a day, but the community which in some poor fashion may reveal the righteousness and justice and love of the unhurried God is not built—it grows—its roots are in the souls of men.

The contrast is very timely today as we Americans indulge in our quadrennial orgy of electing a President. Radio and television and soap-box and whistle-stop oratory fill the air with promises of good things to come. If "the robbers are turned out" or "the mess in Washington cleaned up" or, since nobody approves (at least in political oratory) of either robbers or a mess, if the assertedly excellent achievements of the present administration be carried further all will be well. One catches the familiar note day after day: "you the people, restless, impatient, shall be satisfied."

It is interesting to hear it in the discussions of foreign affairs. Ignoring for our purpose the somewhat weird notion, widely proclaimed, that if only there had been another administration, presumably Republican, China would have been saved from Communism, one finds that even our distinguished General, a little uncomfortable still in his political uniform, goes pretty far along in his ten point program in promising a surer way to peace. Our policy has been negative. Make it positive if you want peace, and so let us promise help to the satellite countries to win back their freedom, a suggestion which brought a shudder to many of our friends in

the free nations. It is clear enough that neither the General nor Mr. Dulles meant anything but the use of peaceful means but few commentators have noted that this program appears to mean another victory for Russia. We apparently propose to do in Poland and Czechoslovakia and the rest what we daily condemn Russia for doing in America.

But whatever the details of difference in the policies of the leaders or of the party platforms the fact remains that half the nation thinks that a change of party will somehow clear the air and bring us along towards a stable peace. The other half finds that result in a growingly more effective continuance of our present policy. However clearly some of the leaders understand (and both Presidential candidates do—Governor Stevenson having made it very clear), everywhere people in their longing for peace forget that the peace for which they long can be found only as a real world community has grown out of the justice and righteousness and love of God. Freedom like peace lies ultimately only in God. We need the patience of God to reach it.

As we come nearer home the same holds true. Whether the Taft-Hartley Law be revised or repealed and a new law takes its place, the law is only a help. Until management and labor alike have lost their fear, until they come together with a sense of common responsibility for the interests of the nation no solution of industrial strife can be found. The patience of God must transcend the impatience of man.

In spite of the title of the NAACP's Annual Report, "The Year of the Hate Bomb," there seems more likelihood than in the past that some Federal action on Civil Rights may be taken. Measures to stop filibustering and to abolish legal segregation in Washington are greatly needed. But again no FEPC laws can do more than help. Only with the patience of God can the "classless" community be created.

But everywhere and always men in their impatience have thought that a "new order" would

make new men. "Free the slaves and all will be well!" We did and the problem still is with us. "Accept Communism and the classless society, with its justice, goodness, freedom and peace will be yours," comes the cry from Russia, and there's nothing more menacing to our free democracy than the counter-cry of those who think that Communism can be met and driven out by the "get-security-quick" methods of Communism itself. There is, to repeat for emphasis, no more ominous factor in our whole political-social order today than the thing represented by the sweeping McCarthy victory in Wisconsin, the great majority by which the McCarran-Walter Bill was passed over the veto, or the fantastic rider to the appropriation for Federal aid in housing projects—the requirement that no one can occupy such housing who belongs to any organization on the Attorney General's list of subversives. That list in itself is bad enough and certainly a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution, but the point being made here is that its use in the Federal Housing Act is just another of these "get-security-quick" methods which are sweeping through the country today.

But neither national security nor world peace can be won in this fashion. Dr. Hromadka at the Faith

and Order Conference in Lund was right in reminding the delegates from the free countries that Communism has something to teach them. Even if, as it seems to most of us, it is only in the words of another professor, "a mirror of our sins," it is worth more than mere hatred. It cannot be driven out by Smith and McCarran Acts, curbed by "Red Channels," exorcised by the incantations of a McCarthy.

As these words were being written the Nixon affair suddenly became the center of political interest. No impartial mind is likely to think Senator Nixon guilty of anything but indiscretion; but people will soon forget that exonerating the Senator does not cure the evil. Raising salaries, laws defining and limiting more clearly political expenditures would help; but the ultimate solution lies in the relation of man to God. Only as his obligation to God takes priority can his obligations to men be wisely adjusted.

And that principle is true of our whole political-social order. Be the people never so impatient, be the value of particular laws never so clear, the community we seek can be won only as its roots lie deep in the hearts of men, as they respond consciously or unconsciously to the creative Lordship of God. The patience of God must transform the impatience of men.—E.L.P.

## A Long Step Forward\*

### First Interpretation

ROBERT L. CALHOUN

THE Advisory Commission on the theme of the next Assembly of the World Council of Churches held its second meeting, September 1-9, 1952, at the Chateau de Bossey near Céligny, Switzerland, not far from Geneva. This meeting was strongly urged last summer by members of the commission, to follow up as speedily as possible its first meeting, at Rolle in July, 1951; and the results have amply justified the decision to meet in 1952. The commission's *First Report*, issued after the sessions at Rolle as "the opening of a conversation" among individual Christians, congregations, and various groups in the churches, has in fact called forth an unprecedented volume of comments, both favorable and unfavorable. Many of these were mimeographed and sent to members of the commission before the meeting at Bossey. Others were distributed and studied at the meeting, either in full or in excerpts and summaries; and the entire body of responses received—a folder more than three inches

thick—was on the table throughout the sessions, for individual inspection.

Twenty-six persons participated in the discussions, formally or informally. Fourteen members of the commission and six members of the World Council staff who had attended the first meeting at Rolle were present also at Bossey. In addition, two old and two new members of the commission and two invited guests attended the sessions, and shared in the work. The absence of several members who could not attend was keenly felt. At the same time, the presence for the first time of Devanandan from India and D. T. Niles from Ceylon, both original members of the commission, was most welcome; and the addition of C. H. Dodd and Paul Minear as members and of Amos Wilder as a participating guest greatly strengthened our resources in Biblical scholarship.

The purpose of the meeting was clearly stated and agreed on at the first session. We were *not* convened to prepare a draft statement for the Assembly at Evanston—not even a rough first draft. Much possible misunderstanding can be avoided if this fact is kept clearly in view. The commission is engaged, with the help of

\*We present two interpretations of the second meeting of the Theological Commission appointed by the World Council of Churches to discuss the Christian Hope as the main theme of the Second Assembly of the World Council to meet in Evanston in 1954.

its friendly critics, in exploring afresh the Christian understanding of the destiny of man and the world—commonly called “Christian eschatology”—together with its roots in and its bearing on Christian life both present and to come. After playing a vital part in the church’s life and thought during most of its history, these problems have become unfamiliar to great numbers of Protestants in recent years, and many traditional ways of stating and trying to solve them have become unsatisfactory. Not only the most familiar current answers, but the very questions themselves, therefore, need to be freshly formulated if their fundamental meaning for Christian faith and for the life of our day is to be made clear.

This is no routine job for a group of specialists, meeting in isolation for a few days and then announcing a set of more or less familiar and easily acceptable conclusions. It is a job for the combined effort of theologians, pastors, and people throughout the time that remains to us, and throughout the whole church, as far as we can enlist the cooperation of Christians everywhere. Not stereotyped answers quickly arrived at and readily accepted, but a real, continuing struggle with the deeply troubling, vital problems of human destiny and Christian hope—this is what our mandate requires us to seek. And this is what has actually begun, within the commission itself and far and wide among the churches. This joint effort, bringing into live and forceful confrontation widely diverse Christian convictions, compelling for all of us reexamination, broadening, and deepening of our partial insights, is well started but by no means finished. It must continue to be carried on, with vigor and devotion; and at the same time it must be pointed more and more definitely toward the face-to-face meeting at Evanston of Christians from all over the world.

The purpose of the sessions at Bossey, therefore, was twofold: to provide for continuance of the conversation with one another and with fellow-Christians everywhere; and to begin mapping the ground for the first draft of a statement to be presented at Evanston two years hence.

Agenda for the Bossey meeting spelled out this purpose. (1) The chief task was to prepare a *Second Report* intended to be our current contribution to the ongoing inquiry. In view of the questions raised and the critical comments provoked by the *First Report*, the second was to attempt both clearer definition and fuller exposition of various major issues in the discussion, and to propose detailed questions and suggestions for further study. (2) A second task, much less extensive, was to consider again how the main theme for Evanston can best be stated in a brief title. (3) A third task, left until the last, was to attempt a preliminary sketch of the structure of a draft statement for Evanston, to be prepared during the coming year for study and redrafting by the commission in August, 1953.

The opening sessions and much informal conversation outside were devoted to review of typical comments received after the publication of the *First Report*, and to presentation of individual statements by several members of the commission. Then began the work of preparing a *Second Report*. Two full days (plus over-

time!) were devoted to section meetings and the drafting of four sectional reports for consideration and revision in plenary sessions to follow. No attempt was made to retain either the order, the wording, or the detailed content of the Rolle document. That had already served the only purpose for which it had ever been intended: “the opening of a conversation.” Instead, a new work-plan with nine sub-headings, suggested largely by the responses to Rolle, was portioned out among the four working sections. One section dealt with the present relevance and urgency of our theme, the problem of language and communication, and the positive meaning of hope in Christ. A second considered the relations of Christian eschatology and apocalyptic, the dual status of “the new Age” as at once here and yet to come, and the corresponding polarity of the Christian life—at once “in Christ” and awaiting him. A third section focused on the relation of the Christian hope to secular utopias and to hopelessness, with a brief reference to the church’s evangelistic mission and need for unity. A fourth section, finally, opened up further the difficult and crucial problem of the relation of the Christian hope to our earthly tasks “and the hopes that accompany them.”

Rough drafts prepared by these sections—a total of some 12,000 words—were then considered and debated in plenary sessions during the last four days. First, the drafts were read consecutively, for an over-all view, before revision began. The immediate impression, shared by most if not all of those present, was that in spite of continuing diversity and even of sharp disagreements within the commission, the reports showed a surprising and most welcome growth in unanimity on many vital issues. Although the sections had worked quite independently, the first results of their work were surprisingly consonant, and bore striking witness to the way in which common presuppositions were coming to light, common modes of expression were being found, and common perspectives for further inquiry were taking shape. There were, of course—and there remain in the text finally approved for publication—many places where the work of achieving clarity and consensus is only begun, not nearly finished. But it was immensely heartening to discover that the relatively detailed and discursive statements brought in by the sections, far more detailed and explicit than the Rolle document, evoked not less general satisfaction but much more. In a year of working on the problems, we had moved closer together, not farther apart.

These drafts were then subjected to full-dress debate in the plenary sessions, to close scrutiny by an editorial committee, and to more or less extensive rewriting by section chairmen and scribes. The process of review and rewriting continued up to the very end of the working sessions, and could well have gone on further, with benefit to the report and to our own understanding of the problems and of one another. Both details and major issues demand further hard study, and none of us could subscribe unreservedly to everything in the present statement. Those parts, in especial, that seek to define the bearing of the Christian hope on the actualities of present-day life need to be worked out much more thoroughly. But the statement represents fairly



enough the present stage of our thinking together, and the lines on which we hope to receive further help from our critics and friends.

At intervals during the six main working days, attention was directed much more briefly to the question of a suitable title for the main theme of the next Assembly, and to the task of sketching out a plan for preparing a draft statement for Evanston. In these discussions, also, careful thought was given to comments on the *First Report* and its Foreword.

When the commission adjourned on the evening of September 8, the agenda had been substantially completed. (1) The *Second Report* in corrected form was sent to the Geneva office of the World Council, and will be printed in the October issue of *The Ecumenical Review*. Reprints of the text will be sent to the churches, and may be obtained by interested individuals and groups for study and comment. (2) A letter respecting the question of a suitable title was addressed to the Central Committee of the World Council, to be considered in its next meeting at Lucknow (India) at the end of December. (3) A first rough plan for a formal Report to the Assembly at Evanston was adopted in outline, and various parts of the proposed draft were assigned for individual work by members of the commission during the coming year. On most headings, two or more members have been assigned to work together, by correspondence or otherwise, and a work-sheet detailing these preliminary assignments is now in the hands of each member. The partial drafts, material for a document of about 15,000 words, are due next July 1. The resulting rough draft, together with responses to the *Second Report*, will be the basis of discussion in the third meeting of the commission, August 22-30, 1953.

It is probably impossible to convey to any one who was not actually present at Rolle and at Bossey an adequate sense of the advance, both in thought and in spirit, that was evident in the second meeting. As we recessed on one of the later days, Karl Barth asked wonderingly: "How do you understand the great difference between where we are now and where we were last year?" However one may try to answer such a question, "the great difference" unquestionably was there; and none of us who felt it can do otherwise than to thank God in all humility for what so clearly is a work of His Spirit among us—a work already palpably begun in the concluding days at Rolle, and now giving far more mature and well-defined promise for our later work.

No one will try to spell out fully the means of such a work of grace, but some at least seem very clear. In the first place, the meeting at Rolle began with almost no common body of specific materials for study and discussion. There was, of course, the whole shared tradition of Christian faith, life, and thought—indispensable, but far too general and variously understood to give very specific guidance for dealing with our concrete assignment. Specific guidance at the start was attempted through nine individual statements on particular aspects of the assigned task; but few of these were available for study in advance, and they were so diverse—in detailed presuppositions, approach, and conclusions—even as regards the very meaning of Christian hope, that they were more helpful in arousing than in guiding

debate. At Rolle, moreover, each of us was far more keenly aware of his own regional constituency than of the universal body of Christians as one common constituency, with which all of us stood in living, responsible relationships.

By contrast, we began at Bossey confronted with a great wealth of vigorous, concrete, often pungent reactions to our *First Report*, from fellow-Christians, churches, and diverse groups in continental Europe, the British Isles, North America, and parts of Asia. Some of these comments, of course, were captious, misdirected, even careless or inattentive in handling the text of the report they criticized. But the overwhelming majority were so clearly responsible, thoughtful, and genuinely concerned, and often so judicious and discerning, that they provided both valuable corrective insights, and a great uplifting sense of shared responsibility for the present stage of our job. Moreover, between Rolle and Bossey, excellent special studies by individuals and groups—for example, by Professors Gustav Wingren of Lund and Wolfgang Schweitzer, now at Heidelberg, and by groups of Biblical scholars meeting at Zetten (Holland) and at Drew Seminary—had been made available. These studies had grown more or less directly out of the discussions opened at Rolle, and sought to give due weight to the major varieties of conviction that had so confusedly come to light there. The Bossey meeting began, thus, with a much better documentary base from which to work.

Quite as important was the advance in personal and corporate preparation by the commission members themselves. We had learned much from one another, at Rolle and later, so that we could start this time with a better awareness of the meaning of our theme, of the problems it involves, and of our various approaches to them. It was possible, therefore, as soon as we divided into sections, to go directly to the problems themselves, instead of groping about trying to find one another. We had learned, in a measure, to recognize one another's terminology, to appreciate and not merely to deplore many of our diversities, even to anticipate and allow for one another's special concerns. Not less important was growth in mutual confidence, and in readiness to put the best rather than the worst possible construction on the words and thoughts of an opponent in debate. Naturally partisanship, half-disciplined glee over others' discomfiture, and anxiety lest one's own preferences be slighted were not lacking. Theologians also are human. But this time we began to see an always heartening sight: strong partisans defending against misunderstanding some one not of their own camp—as Barth, for example, defended Dodd through a long discussion after hours, against what he insisted was misapprehension by two embattled champions of the eschatological future. The sturdy character of this new spirit of the group, as well as the fine temper of those present for the first time, was made evident in the ease with which six newcomers—five of them very active participants in the sessions—became integral members of the working body.

Advance of another sort, in the actual character of the work now being done, can most appropriately be labeled advance toward Evanston. The commission has now

begun to attack in concrete detail the problems of relating the theme to the everyday life of church and world: the problems of language and communication, of values and disvalues in secular life, of evangelism, reformation, and unity of the church. It will undertake, in due course,

the job of making clear the relations of the main theme to the six subsidiary themes to be dealt with during the second week at Evanston. The basic pattern of its activity has decisively changed, from preliminary exploration to systematic work.

## Second Interpretation

ROBERT S. BILHEIMER

ONE of the most interesting, difficult and valuable theological developments in the ecumenical movement is the current discussion, in eschatological terms, of the ultimate Christian hope. So far as official ecumenical circles are concerned, this discussion was started a year ago by the Advisory Commission on the Theme of the Second Assembly, appointed by the World Council of Churches. During the past summer, however, it became evident that the subject is not confined to the thirty theologians of the World Council's Commission, but that it is rooted in very widely differing areas of the church's life. It was a major point of debate at the Willingen Conference of the International Missionary Council, equaling if not surpassing the central subject of the mission and the unity of the church. Similarly at the Lund Conference on Faith and Order, which brought together a quite different group of people, the subject was paramount. The Report of the Lund Conference, speaking of "The Church between the First and the Final Coming of Christ," describes the church as a pilgrim people in a strange land, guided by the Holy Spirit. "At the end of its pilgrimage Jesus Christ, the Crucified and Risen, will come again to meet His Church in order to complete His work of redemption and judgment. Out of all peoples and ages he will gather his own who look for his appearing and for a new heaven and a new earth, and he will consummate the union between Christ and his Church in the eternal Kingdom of God." Behind this statement and others in the Report lay the concerns and temper of the speeches and the discussions. Complete agreement on the subject was not apparent at Lund, and still less so at Willingen, but throughout both conferences eschatological terms of reference were apparent in such a central way that they could not be denied.

The Advisory Commission on the Theme of the Assembly met following the Willingen and Lund Conferences, and in the light of the preceding year's discussion in the churches of its own First Report. A year ago, the First Report of the Advisory Commission had been referred by the Central Committee of the World Council to the member churches for study and comment. It was hoped that comment would be concerned not only with the detail of the Report but also with its central, eschatological conception of the Christian hope. At the beginning of the meeting this past summer, Dr. Visser 't Hooft, Secretary of the Commission and General Secretary of the World Council, gave a complete report of the comments received during the year. Three points stood out. First, no document of

the World Council of Churches since Amsterdam has received such widespread attention as the First Report of the commission. Individuals, groups and official church bodies have all responded in large volume. The Report has been a matter of debate in the religious press throughout the world. Comment has come from every major area of the world where there are member churches of the World Council.

Second, the comment has been on the whole favorable to the main point of the Report. This is to say that the response to the general eschatological conception of Christian hope contained in the Report has been favorable beyond any dispute. Four communications from the United States are cases in point: the official statements of the Methodist Church, the American Baptist Convention, the Presbyterian Church U. S., and the Conference of U. S. A. Member Churches of the World Council, representing all of the U. S. A. member churches, all concurred in favoring the main element in the First Report. This general reaction was typical of other parts of the world as well.

Third, in America as well as virtually everywhere else, criticism of certain elements in the Report has been sharp. Terminology has presented a major difficulty. The Biblical language of the First Report, as well as the terms used to describe its eschatological references, created difficulty of very serious nature. Heavy criticism was leveled at the imbalance in the First Report between its stress upon the expectancy of the future Christ and its comparative lack of stress upon the present life in Christ. Nearly all of the communications from America, together with many from other parts of the world, made this comment and in vigorous language. It was felt on the part of most also that the First Report had failed to make its eschatological conceptions relevant to the present world scene. This, of course, the First Report had admitted, in the "Note," which indicated that the relation between the ultimate Hope and the many proximate hopes of Christian life was a matter of disagreement. Nevertheless, critics rightly insisted upon underlining the point.

The result of the second meeting of the Advisory Commission is a second report of approximately 10,000 words in length, made public on October 1. As in the case of the First Report, the second statement is carefully distinguished from a first draft of the document to be presented ultimately to the Assembly for its consideration. This Second Report is emphatically not such a first draft, but rather another report on the present mind of the commission, aimed at continuing the dis-

cussion started in the churches by the First Report, and drawn up with a view to clarifying issues and—it is hoped—advancing the discussion a stage further.

One of the first issues dealt with is the problem of terminology. Here the difficulties are immense. One of the most basic concerns is the use of Biblical language. If it is used simply as it is, without interpretation, the danger of using it out of context is acute, as is the danger of suggesting a literal acceptance of language which in the Bible itself is symbolic. If, however, the attempt is made to translate the Biblical language, the words used to translate it are themselves fraught with various meanings in various tongues. The phrase "second coming" for instance will in one language raise both positive and negative reactions, whereas for many other modern languages it does not exist as a phrase. "Second advent," "parousia," "last judgment," "last things," "the end of the world," and many other such words and phrases are all liable to misunderstanding. The difference between the Biblical meaning and the general meaning of certain words also creates a difficulty. This is particularly true of "hope," which in common speech usually means a wish, but in the Bible means the assurance of what God has promised. Imperative as is the need to translate Biblical language into meaningful terms, any such attempt is inherently fraught with danger, lest the Biblical meaning be dissipated or distorted. The commission had to wrestle with this problem in its own work and among its own members, and urges all who are engaged in this discussion to attempt to get behind words to the meaning which people attach to them, and to grapple with the Biblical words and concepts. "To those who will listen, the Bible is not only a book to be read and wrestled with, but a book that speaks, and speaks a sovereign language which compels attention and obedience and transforms and renews the mind."

Clarity in language and concept is particularly needed at one decisive point. Much that had been said and written concerning the First Report indicated a confusion between eschatological and apocalyptic. The Second Report defines Christian eschatology as "our Christian understanding of the future and of the destiny of man and the world," and contrasts this with the views of many apocalyptists. Sub-Christian apocalypticism tends to emphasize a secret avenue of communication with God, either through direct private channels or by piecing bits of ancient prophecy together, revealing frequently in a partisan and divisive character, goals which are on the whole self-centered and short-term. Extraneous themes concerning the constitution of the world, the angelic orders, elaborate calculations of the time scheme for the "last things" and the like are all more or less typical of such apocalypticism. True eschatology, on the other hand, calls for the vigilance of the watchman, alert for the signs of the fulfillment of God's purpose, expecting that God's promise and warning to all men will be realized. Such a distinction between eschatology and apocalyptic should help American Christians to recognize the position of the commission more clearly, and to distinguish it from the more objectionable types of thought which have done such a

disservice to true Christian eschatology by confusing it hopelessly with a cheap apocalypticism.

A second fundamental issue in the current Report concerns the balance between the reality of life in Christ now and the future expectation. This is dealt with from the viewpoint of the "New Age" and the "Believer in Christ." At both points, it is maintained that there is a duality in the Christian view. On the one hand, the "New Age" has already come. On the other hand, this present "New Age" is not complete and awaits its fulfillment at the end of history. "Both of these affirmations are essential to the Christian gospel, and they must be steadily maintained together. Neither one apart from the other can tell the full truth." So also with the life of the believer. "He is now in Christ and yet expects His coming again. He has already died with Christ and risen with Him, yet he looks forward to the resurrection at the Last Day. Justice must be done to both aspects of salvation." When this balance, or better this tension, is maintained, two dangers are avoided. The one is the danger of "futuristic eschatology," which says that the "New Age," once visible in Christ, is now absent from the Christ of the past and the Christ of the future. The other is the danger of any set of views which would disparage the completion of God's purposes beyond history and look for them to be fulfilled within history itself. The full Christian view, rather, looks for a consummation which is not an event within the historical series, but which is neither an abrogation of history, but rather a genuine and final redemption of it, involving judgment, transformation and fulfillment. "It is here, moreover, that the exalted language of the imagination often employed by prophets, poets and apocalyptic seers comes to its own. For here we are speaking of matters which, in the nature of things, cannot find direct expression in explicit speech. The Holy City whose gates are ever open, which needs neither sun nor moon because God is its light; the perpetual hymn sung by all created beings to the praise of the Eternal; the endless Sabbath; the vision of God face to face—all these are images which suggest, without defining, a completion of man's fragmentary existence, into which the values achieved within history are gathered up, to be shared endlessly in perfect communion by all God's children."

In its third major point, the Second Report seriously deals with the situation of men today as this relates to their hopes. Sensitive recognition is given to those who are without hope—the hopeless, the despairing, the sober—in an effort to show how it may be that Jesus Christ in his suffering and his sharing of our human situation gathers up even deep despair and transforms it into hope. The false hopes that grip so much of mankind—Stalinism, scientific humanism, democratic utopianism—are each examined, always in sensitive, and frequently in moving and beautiful language, and a similar attempt is made to relate the hope in Christ to the particular errors of each of these utopianisms. But in addition to this, the Report relates the ultimate hope to our earthly calling and task. The crucial point, in relation to peace, righteousness, freedom, life and truth, lies in the contrast between the hope which the Kingdom of God holds for these things and the denial of these



things in present life. The vision of peace stirs us to action when there is no peace; the knowledge of truth makes us strive against all sham and lies; the experience of freedom in Christ makes us fight against tyranny.

This Second Report is thus offered as an attempt by the commission to reply to the major criticisms of the First Report and to develop its own conception of the Christian hope. It is hoped very deeply that many individuals and groups will give their judgment as to the value of the thinking contained in it. It is offered as a contribution to discussion. In the course of the meeting, one could not help but be struck by a very great change within the group as contrasted with the first meeting. A unity of understanding and thought had developed which scarcely any member of the commission would have thought possible. Members of the commission present were: John Baillie, Karl Barth, Kathleen Bliss, Robert Calhoun, Paul Devanandan, C. H. Dodd, George Florovsky, Hendrik Kraemer, Donald MacKinnon, Francis Miller, Paul Minear, Walter Muelder, Lesslie Newbigin, D. T. Niles, Edmund Schlink, G. F. Thomas, W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Heinrich Vogel, Gustav Wingren, and as guests, Amos Wilder and Johannes Lombard. That list gives great significance to the statement that except for one point, there were no great gulfs of opinion, but that a common ground of unity did exist which enabled the commission to speak.

The single point concerns the relation of the Christian hope to the common task. For many in the commission, that which now appears in the report is not satisfactory. The present writer would feel that it is not correct to assume that because one gets a vision of something called peace in the Gospel one is thereby driven to work for international peace and justice. The Gospel is not to be divided according to our categories of time, and neither is it to be divided according to our categories of human need. The total impact of Jesus Christ is that which makes us work in love for many good and noble causes. Our faith in Him, which is inseparable from our love for Him and our hope for His victory, is that which animates our whole life, now to work for peace, now for justice, now for freedom, and always for the love of Christ in the world. In addition, the report on the whole sidesteps the issues of the place of world evangelism in relation to the ultimate Christian hope. Is the Great Commission itself a part of the ultimate coming of the Kingdom and to be thought of only in those terms, or is it an intermediary hope, lying beyond our human hopes but short of the ultimate hope, yet related to it? What bearing has the command and the promise implicit in it upon our earthly calling to work for the values of justice and truth and freedom? A short note at the end of the Report on the mission and unity of the church does more to indicate the commission's awareness of the problem than to shed light upon the solution to it.

These are, however, relatively minor problems, important as they are. On some of the great and crucial issues a measure of unity has been given the commission which, it is hoped, will be useful in stimulating further thought and discussion, and a greater measure of unity in the whole church upon the central theme of Christian Hope.

## Correspondence:

DEAR SIR:

Coming as it did during the furor of "the Nixon case," the admirable article by Dr. Roger Shinn on "The Theology of Political Campaigns" (*Christianity and Crisis*, September 15, 1952), served as a breath of fresh air across a clouded political landscape. And the Nixon case itself has furnished some rather interesting documentation for Dr. Shinn's contentions.

To many people there was something refreshing about General Eisenhower's demand that Mr. Nixon "vindicate" himself fully and completely. Although dissenters from the General's political position can argue that this was just "good politics," others less cynically minded could see that he was wrestling with what was for him a genuine moral problem, and the fact that the Republican press generally went along with Eisenhower in his demand reflects more favorably on the health of the party than Senator Taft's immediate comment that no issue whatsoever was at stake.

However, the disturbing thing from the point of view of political self-righteousness is not only the militant self-righteousness of Mr. Nixon himself (one wonders what he would have said had it been revealed that one of his opponents had gotten \$18,000 from a labor union for political expenses), but also the fact that the very people who profess to see a moral issue in Mr. Nixon's fund either cannot or will not see any moral issue in the open alliance which they have made with Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin and Senator Jenner of Indiana. To many thinking people an open embrace of McCarthyism is a much more morally reprehensible thing than for Mr. Nixon to have gotten aid in printing his speeches. In terms of the health of the nation, the influence McCarthy will now have in Republican circles is more sinister than the influence a few real estate and oil men may possibly have had on Mr. Nixon. Those who have called the Nixon fund a moral problem seem unable to recognize the McCarthy embrace as a moral problem. It is true that we churchmen must not ourselves become too self-righteous about this matter when such eminent Protestants as Dan Poling come out openly for McCarthy. But shocking as that fact is, it does not commit the rest of the Protestant clergy or laity to follow in Mr. Poling's footsteps, while the party embrace of McCarthy will force many people to support him on the grounds that there is no substitute for victory and no loyalty, apparently, higher than party loyalty. When a moral issue can be raised by Mr. Nixon's activity, but no moral issue raised by Mr. McCarthy's activity, there is moral astigmatism present somewhere.

But there is an even clearer example of political self-righteousness in the attitude which Mr. Nixon immediately took when the question of the propriety of his \$18,000 fund was first raised. His reaction, throughout the whole of the episode, has been that it was nothing but a "typical left-wing smear." Sometimes it was called a "communist smear." Later on it was admitted that some people might have honestly misunderstood the matter, but the left-wing line was clearly the predominant one.

# Christianity and Crisis

*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*  
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

M. SEARLE BATES	LISTON POPE
JOHN C. BENNETT	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	AMOS N. WILDER
GLOSTER MONK, <i>Secretary</i>	

## CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	

It is amazing that there has been no appreciable public reaction to this kind of reasoning, for this is surely one of the most significant and disturbing facts of the entire episode. Mr. Nixon has revealed an attitude which is simply a somewhat refined (and not too refined at that) version of the McCarthy line. The line is very simple: I am *against* Communism, therefore those who oppose me are *for* Communism. In Nixon's case the syllogism runs: I have opposed the leftists, therefore those who *attack* me are leftists themselves. And while many people might be proud to hold the tag "leftist" when it is distinguished from Mr. Nixon's brand of belief, that word is an emotionally charged word today, with over-

tones of treason, subversive activity, and traitorous intent, and Mr. Nixon has been one of those most responsible for making it so. Because Mr. Nixon is anti-Communist he seems to be assuming that he is thereby rendered invulnerable and infallible, and that the only reason people could ever question his integrity would be because of some nasty affinity with communist aims.

This is an extremely dangerous line of reasoning, and a very popular one as not only Senator McCarthy has made us so aware, but as Senator Nixon's previous congressional campaigns against Jerry Voorhees and Helen Gahagan Douglas also served to illustrate. It is dangerous because the logic of it means that a self-avowed anti-Communist is by definition to be immune from attack, and because it precludes the possibility of raising questions about an individual's suitability for public office on other grounds than the communist issue. And the fact that a candidate for vice-president apparently believes in this kind of reasoning is certainly a much more basic issue than the suitability or the unsuitability of his having accepted a sum of money for clerical work. His initial act of accepting the money may have been regrettable, but his attempt to discredit those whose eyebrows were raised, by insinuating that such action turned them into fellow-travellers or worse, is even more regrettable.

Nothing that has been said is to be construed as suggesting that the Democratic party is without guile and self-deception, but simply that the Nixon case, on various levels, has furnished a particularly telling example of the kind of self-righteousness which permeates all of our political life.

ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN  
DEPT. OF RELIGION

MACALESTER COLLEGE  
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

## Anglicans Seek Cooperation

Toronto (RNS)—A motion aimed at promoting efforts to achieve reunion with the United Church of Canada was passed unanimously here by the Synod of the Anglican Diocese of Toronto.

The synod also adopted an amendment calling for cooperation on parish levels as an aid to reunion efforts.

"It is vain to talk about reunion, which is distant, unless we have cooperation," said Prof. E. A. Dale, who proposed the motion. "There is not yet enough interest in the matter at what we call the grass roots."

Canon H. R. Hunt said that a joint report on reunion by the negotiating bodies of the Anglican and the United Churches would be made at the national assemblies of the two communions.

"There is good will and cooperation between us and the United Church," he said. "I am confident that our reunion in Christ is possible."

## Authors in This Issue

Robert L. Calhoun is Professor of Historical Theology at Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

Robert S. Bilheimer is Program Secretary of the World Council of Churches for North America.

Detroit Public Library  
Book Receiving  
5201 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-53